UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,755	04/23/2001	Vasily A. Topolkaraev	44040-254221	4991

7590 04/29/2005

G. Peter Nichols
Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER	
BOYD, JENNIFER A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1771	

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/840,755	TOPOLKARAEV ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer A. Boyd	1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 February 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 16-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 16-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Applicant's Amendments and Accompanying Remarks, filed February 7, 2005, have been entered and have been carefully considered. Claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 21 are pending. In view of Applicant's Terminal Disclaimer over USSN 09/840754 and statement of common ownership of Topolkaraev (US 6,586,354) at the time the invention of the present application was made, the Examiner withdraws all previously set forth rejections as detailed in the Office Action dated November 4, 2004. However, after an updated search, additional prior art has been found which renders the invention as currently claimed unpatentable for reasons herein below.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 6, 8 – 9 and 16 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (US 5,851,937).

Wu is directed to a cloth-like totally biodegradable and/or compostable composite (Title) suitable for applications including diapers, pants, surgical gowns, dressings, sheets, hygienic products and the like (Abstract).

As to claims 1 and 21, Wu teaches a film comprising polycaprolactone blended with polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) (column 2, lines 35 – 50). The Examiner equates the polycaprolactone to Applicant's "biodegradable polymer"; it is indicated on page 6 of Applicant's Specification

that polycaprolactone is a biodegradable polymer. The Examiner equates the polyvinyl alcohol to Applicant's "water soluble polymer"; it is indicated on page 6 of Applicant's Specification that polyvinyl alcohol is a water soluble polymer. Wu teaches that the composite can be incrementally stretched to create a film with micropores or microvoids (column 3, lines 65 – 69 and column 4, lines 1 – 2). The microvoid formation caused breathability in the biodegradable and/or compostable thermoplastic film. The breathability allows air and moisture vapor to breathe or pass through the film. Further, the increased surface area provided by stretching the film accordingly enhances the biodegradability and/or compostability of the film (column 4, lines 1 – 10).

As to claims 5 and 6, Wu teaches a film comprising polycaprolactone blended with polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) (column 2, lines 35 – 50). The Examiner equates the polycaprolactone to Applicant's "biodegradable polymer" and the polyvinyl alcohol to Applicant's "water soluble polymer".

As to claim 16, Wu teaches that the composite can comprise one or more plies of the totally biodegradable and/or compostable film and one or more plies of totally biodegradable and/or compostable nonwoven web (column 2, lines 15 – 25). The film is laminated to the nonwoven web (column 2, lines 20 – 30).

As to claim 17, Wu teaches that the composite is suitable for applications including diapers, pants, surgical gowns, dressings, sheets, hygienic products and the like (Abstract).

As to claim 18, Wu teaches that the composite is biodegradable (Title) so it is implied that it is used in disposable applications.

As to claims 1 – 3 and 19, Wu teaches the claimed invention but fails to disclose claimed water vapor transmission rate of greater than 2500 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 1, water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3000 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 2, water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3500 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 3 and the film is stretched from about 100 – 500 percent of its original length as required by claim 19. It should be noted that water vapor transmission rate and percentage of stretching are result effective variable. Wu teaches that the composite can be incrementally stretched to create a film with micropores or microvoids (column 3, lines 65 – 69 and column 4, lines 1 – 2). The microvoid formation caused breathability and enhanced biodegradability in the biodegradable and/or compostable thermoplastic film (column 4, lines 1 – 15). As the film is stretched to a greater extent, more microvoids form and as a result the film has a higher water vapor transmission rate and enhanced biodegradability. If the film is stretched too much, the film will become too weak and break. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stretch the film to a certain level to create a film with a vapor transmission rate of greater than 2500 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 1, water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3000 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 2, water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3500 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 3 and the film is stretched from about 100 – 500 percent of its original length as required by claim 19 since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In the present invention, one would have been motivated to stretch a film to an optimal level to create film with a high water vapor transmission rate making it suitable for disposable products.

As to claims 8 – 9 and 20, although Wu does not explicitly teach the claimed elongation at break of greater than about 100% as required by claim 8, elongation at break of greater than about 200% as required by claim 9 and elongation at break of about 350% or greater as required by claim 20, it is reasonable to presume that said properties are inherent. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e a stretched biodegradable film comprising a composition of a blended mixture of a biodegradable polymer and a water soluble polymer having a water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3500 $g/m^2/24$ hours), which would result in the claimed property. The burden is upon the Applicant to prove otherwise. In addition, the presently claimed properties of elongation at break of greater than about 100% as required by claim 8, elongation at break of greater than about 200% as required by claim 9 and elongation at break of about 350% or greater as required by claim 20 would obviously have been present once the Wu product is provided.

4. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 6, 8 – 14 and 17– 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (US 5,200,247).

Wu is directed to a biodegradable film suitable for diaper backsheets, sanitary napkins and pads and other medical packaging and garment applications (column 2, lines 50 – 55).

As to claims 1 and 21, Wu teaches a biodegradable film comprising a blend of an alkanoyl polymer and a polyvinyl alcohol polymer (column 1, lines 65 – 69). Wu teaches in Examples 1 – 6 the use of blended polycaprolactone and polyvinyl alcohol to form the film (column 7, lines 59 – 65). The Examiner equates the polycaprolactone to Applicant's

"biodegradable polymer"; it is indicated on page 6 of Applicant's Specification that polycaprolactone is a biodegradable polymer. The Examiner equates the polyvinyl alcohol to Applicant's "water soluble polymer"; it is indicated on page 6 of Applicant's Specification that polyvinyl alcohol is a water soluble polymer. Wu teaches that the films in Examples 1 – 6 were mechanically stretched (column 8, lines 1 – 3).

As to claims 5 and 6, Wu teaches in Examples 1 – 6 the use of blended polycaprolactone and polyvinyl alcohol to form the film (column 7, lines 59 – 65). The Examiner equates the polycaprolactone to Applicant's "biodegradable polymer" and the polyvinyl alcohol to Applicant's "water soluble polymer".

As to claims 10 – 13, Wu teaches that the film preferably comprises 10 – 25% polyvinyl alcohol, or "water soluble polymer", and 90 – 75% thermoplastic dialkanoyl or oxyalkanoyl polymer, or "biodegradable polymer" (column 2, lines 15 – 25).

As to claim 14, Wu teaches that the film has a thickness between 1 – 25 mils (column 4, lines 40 – 50).

As to claim 17, Wu teaches that the composite is suitable for diaper backsheets, sanitary napkins and pads and other medical packaging and garment applications (column 2, lines 50 – 55).

As to claim 18, Wu teaches that the composite is biodegradable (Title) so it is implied that it is used in disposable applications.

As to claims 1 – 3 and 19, Wu teaches the claimed invention but fails to disclose claimed

water vapor transmission rate of greater than 2500 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 1, water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3000 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 2, water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3500 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 3 and the film is stretched from about 100 – 500 percent of its original length as required by claim 19. It should be noted that water vapor transmission rate and percentage of stretching are result effective variable. Wu teaches that micropores or microvoids may be formed in the film by stretching at room temperature. The stretched areas weaken the film to further enhance its degradation while maintaining film water impermeability (column 2, lines 25 – 50). As the film is stretched to a greater extent, more microvoids form and as a result the film has a higher water vapor transmission rate and enhanced biodegradability. If the film is stretched too much, the film will become too weak and break. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stretch the film to a certain level to create a film with a vapor transmission rate of greater than 2500 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 1, water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3000 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 2, water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3500 g/m^2/24 hours as required by claim 3 and the film is stretched from about 100 – 500 percent of its original length as required by claim 19 since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In the present invention, one would have been motivated to stretch a film to an optimal level to create film with a high water vapor transmission rate making it suitable for disposable products.

As to claims 8 – 9 and 20, although Wu does not explicitly teach the claimed elongation at break of greater than about 100% as required by claim 8, elongation at break of greater than about 200% as required by claim 9 and elongation at break of about 350% or greater as required by claim 20, it is reasonable to presume that said properties are inherent. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e a stretched biodegradable film comprising a composition of a blended mixture of a biodegradable polymer and a water soluble polymer having a water vapor transmission rate of greater than 3500 $g/m^2/24$ hours), which would result in the claimed property. The burden is upon the Applicant to prove otherwise. In addition, the presently claimed properties of elongation at break of greater than about 100% as required by claim 8, elongation at break of greater than about 200% as required by claim 9 and elongation at break of about 350% or greater as required by claim 20 would obviously have been present once the Wu product is provided.

5. Claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroll et al. (US 6,432,547) in view of Tsai et al. (US 6,838,403).

Kroll is directed to a breathable film layer composition (Title) useful in applications such as disposable articles such as disposable diapers, feminine napkins and medical devices and dressings (column 1, lines 10 – 17).

As to claims 1 and 21, Kroll teaches a composition useful for forming a film layer comprising a thermoplastic composition comprising ***at least one*** thermoplastic polymer and at least one diluent or radiation responsive composition (column 1, lines 55 – 60). Kroll teaches that the thermoplastic polymer can comprise water swellable polymers, water soluble polymers,

water dispersible polymers or biodegradable polymers (column 2, lines 55 – 62). Kroll teaches that the WVTR is most preferably from 1000 to 2000 g/m^2/day ***or higher*** (column 2, lines 40 – 44), meeting Applicant's requirement of greater than 2500 g/m^2/day. Kroll teaches that the film is useful in applications such as disposable articles such as disposable diapers, feminine napkins and medical devices and dressings (column 1, lines 10 – 17).

As to claims 2 – 3, Kroll teaches that the WVTR is most preferably from 1000 to 2000 g/m^2/day ***or higher*** (column 2, lines 40 – 44), meeting Applicant's requirement of greater than 3000 and greater than 3500 g/m^2/day.

As to claims 4 - 5, Kroll teaches the use of polycaprolactone and polylactic acid as the biodegradable polymer (column 6, lines 15 – 22). It should be noted that polycaprolactone and polylactic acid are aliphatic polyesters as stated on page 6, lines 1 – 20 of Applicant's Specification.

As to claim 6, Kroll teaches the use of polyvinyl alcohol as one of the thermoplastic polymers (column 5, lines 5 – 15).

As to claim 7, Kroll teaches the use of polyethylene oxide as one of the thermoplastic polymers (column 5, lines 5 – 15).

As to claim 14, Kroll teaches that the film can be about 0.8 to 2 mils (column 2, lines 19 – 22).

As to claims 17 and 18, Kroll teaches that the film is useful in applications such as disposable articles such as disposable diapers, feminine napkins and medical devices and dressings (column 1, lines 10 – 17).

Kroll fails to teach that the film is stretched as required by claim 1 and specifically that the film is stretched 100 – 500 percent of its original length as required by claim 19. Kroll fails to teach that the film is laminated to a nonwoven web as required by claim 16.

Tsai et al. is directed to breathable biodegradable/compostable laminates for use in personal care products (Abstract). Tsai teaches a two-layer structure wherein one layer is a biodegradable nonwoven material and the other material is a filled, biodegradable film (column 3, lines 44 – 50). The biodegradable film is stretched to enhance the breathability of the film. When stretched, the biodegradable polymer portions of the film slowly move away from the filler materials such that the micropores caused by the filler materials become larger, thereby increasing the amount of water vapor that may pass through the film, and therefore enhancing its breathability (column 5, lines 20 – 35). Tsai teaches that the film is stretched from about 100 to 500 percent of its original length (column 5, lines 40 – 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stretch the film of Kroll between 100 – 500 percent of its original length as suggested by Tsai et al. motivated by the desire to enhance water vapor transport through the film, improve water access, enhance the degradability of the film and enhance the elastomeric properties of the film (column 11, lines 30 – 40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to laminate the film of Kroll to a nonwoven as suggested by Tsai et al. motivated by the desire to create a composite suitable for use in disposable personal care items as desired by Kroll.

As to claims 10 – 13, Kroll in view of Tsai et al. discloses the claimed invention except for that the biodegradable film comprises about 1 – 50% water soluble polymer as required by claim 10, comprises 5 – 30% water soluble polymer as required by claim 11, requires 50 – 99% biodegradable polymer as required by claim 12 and requires 70 – 95% biodegradable polymer as required by claim 13. It should be noted that the amount of water soluble polymer, amount of biodegradable polymer and amount the film is stretched are result effective variables. For example, as the amount of the water soluble polymer increases, the breathability and water sensitivity of the film increases. As the amount of biodegradable polymer increases, the biodegradability of the film increases. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the biodegradable film comprising about 1 – 50% water soluble polymer as required by claim 10, comprises 5 – 30% water soluble polymer as required by claim 11, requires 50 – 99% biodegradable polymer as required by claim 12, requires 70 – 95% biodegradable polymer as required by claim 13 since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In the present invention, one would have been motivated to optimize the amount of biodegradable polymer, water soluble polymer and the amount the film has been stretched to create a film with optimal strength, water sensitivity and breathability.

As to claims 8 – 9 and 20, although Kroll in view of Tsai et al. does not explicitly teach the claimed elongation at break of greater than about 100% as required by claim 8, elongation at break of greater than about 200% as required by claim 9 and elongation at break of about 350%

or greater as required by claim 20, it is reasonable to presume that said properties are inherent. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e a biodegradable film comprising a composition of a blended mixture of a biodegradable polymer and a water soluble polymer which is stretched from about 100 – 500 percent of its original length) which would result in the claimed property. The burden is upon the Applicant to prove otherwise. In addition, the presently claimed properties of elongation at break of greater than about 100% as required by claim 8, elongation at break of greater than about 200% as required by claim 9 and elongation at break of about 350% or greater as required by claim 20 would obviously have been present once the Kroll in view of Tsai et al. product is provided.

6. Claims 1 – 14 and 17 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroll et al. (US 6,432,547) in view of Noda et al. (US 6,808,795).

Kroll is directed to a breathable film layer composition (Title) useful in applications such as disposable articles such as disposable diapers, feminine napkins and medical devices and dressings (column 1, lines 10 – 17).

As to claims 1 and 21, Kroll teaches a composition useful for forming a film layer comprising a thermoplastic composition comprising ***at least one*** thermoplastic polymer and at least one diluent or radiation responsive composition (column 1, lines 55 – 60). Kroll teaches that the thermoplastic polymer can comprise water swellable polymers, water soluble polymers, water dispersible polymers or biodegradable polymers (column 2, lines 55 – 62). Kroll teaches that the WVTR is most preferably from 1000 to 2000 $g/m^2/day$ ***or higher*** (column 2, lines 40 – 44), meeting Applicant's requirement of greater than 2500 $g/m^2/day$. Kroll teaches that the film

is useful in applications such as disposable articles such as disposable diapers, feminine napkins and medical devices and dressings (column 1, lines 10 – 17).

As to claims 2 – 3, Kroll teaches that the WVTR is most preferably from 1000 to 2000 $g/m^2/day$ ***or higher*** (column 2, lines 40 – 44), meeting Applicant's requirement of greater than 3000 and greater than 3500 $g/m^2/day$.

As to claims 4 - 5, Kroll teaches the use of polycaprolactone and polylactic acid as the biodegradable polymer (column 6, lines 15 – 22). It should be noted that polycaprolactone and polylactic acid are aliphatic polyesters as stated on page 6, lines 1 – 20 of Applicant's Specification.

As to claim 6, Kroll teaches the use of polyvinyl alcohol as one of the thermoplastic polymers (column 5, lines 5 – 15).

As to claim 7, Kroll teaches the use of polyethylene oxide as one of the thermoplastic polymers (column 5, lines 5 – 15).

As to claim 14, Kroll teaches that the film can be about 0.8 to 2 mils (column 2, lines 19 – 22).

As to claims 17 and 18, Kroll teaches that the film is useful in applications such as disposable articles such as disposable diapers, feminine napkins and medical devices and dressings (column 1, lines 10 – 17).

Kroll fails to teach that the film is stretched as required by claim 1 and specifically that the film is stretched 100 – 500 percent of its original length as required by claim 19.

Noda is directed to an environmentally degradable film suitable for disposable articles (Abstract). Noda teaches in Example 6 stretching the film at various percentages ranging from 0% - 400% in the cross-machine direction. As the amount of stretch in the cross-machine direction is increased, the water transmission rate will be increased to many values greater than the unstretched film (column 15, lines 55 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stretch the film of Kroll between 0 – 400 percent of its original length as suggested by Noda motivated by the desire to enhance water vapor transmission rate through the film (column 15, lines 55 – 67).

As to claims 10 – 13, Kroll in view of Noda discloses the claimed invention except for that the biodegradable film comprises about 1 – 50% water soluble polymer as required by claim 10, comprises 5 – 30% water soluble polymer as required by claim 11, requires 50 – 99% biodegradable polymer as required by claim 12 and requires 70 – 95% biodegradable polymer as required by claim 13. It should be noted that the amount of water soluble polymer, amount of biodegradable polymer and amount the film is stretched are result effective variables. For example, as the amount of the water soluble polymer increases, the breathability and water sensitivity of the film increases. As the amount of biodegradable polymer increases, the biodegradability of the film increases. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the biodegradable film comprising about 1 – 50% water soluble polymer as required by claim 10, comprises 5 – 30% water soluble polymer

as required by claim 11, requires 50 – 99% biodegradable polymer as required by claim 12, requires 70 – 95% biodegradable polymer as required by claim 13 since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In the present invention, one would have been motivated to optimize the amount of biodegradable polymer, water soluble polymer and the amount the film has been stretched to create a film with optimal strength, water sensitivity and breathability.

As to claims 8 – 9 and 20, although Kroll in view of Noda does not explicitly teach the claimed elongation at break of greater than about 100% as required by claim 8, elongation at break of greater than about 200% as required by claim 9 and elongation at break of about 350% or greater as required by claim 20, it is reasonable to presume that said properties are inherent. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e a biodegradable film comprising a composition of a blended mixture of a biodegradable polymer and a water soluble polymer which is stretched from about 100 – 500 percent of its original length) which would result in the claimed property. The burden is upon the Applicant to prove otherwise. In addition, the presently claimed properties of elongation at break of greater than about 100% as required by claim 8, elongation at break of greater than about 200% as required by claim 9 and elongation at break of about 350% or greater as required by claim 20 would obviously have been present once the Kroll in view of Noda product is provided.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 14 and 16 – 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer A. Boyd whose telephone number is 571-272-1473. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday (8:30am - 6:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer Boyd
April 20, 2005

Ula Ruddock
Ula C. Ruddock
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 1700